

REMARKS

The allowance of Claims 4 and 5 is noted with appreciation. However the Examiner inadvertently grouped these claims also with those rejected

It is proposed to further amend independent claims 1 and 6 to emphasize the distinctions over the cited art stressed in the previous response and are submitted for reconsideration along with dependent claims 2 and 3. for the reasons now to be set out.

The noted relevance of the Spence et al reference applied by the Examiner is well taken and the claims have been amended to more fully distinguish over it. Spence et al clearly is an attempt to permit simple testing of electronic circuits, but requires the camera output to be interpreted by a complex neural network. Applicant, on the other hand, employs a device that reads the thermal image and directly converts it into a temperature output that requires no further interpretation and the determination of the condition of the circuit is based solely on this data thus eliminating the costly steps of the reference. The claims have been amended to further stress this difference. Thus it is most respectfully submitted that entry of this amendment will place the case in condition for allowance. Favorable action to this end is most respectfully requested

Respectfully submitted:



Ernest A. Boutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 717-4821
Pacific Time

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 11 2003

OFFICIAL